arXiv:1206.4273v1 [math.AP] 19 Jun 2012

Regularity of stable solutions of a Lane-Emden type system

Craig Cowan
Department of Mathematical Sciences
University of Alabama in Huntsville
258A Shelby Center
Huntsville, AL 35899
ctcowan@stanford.edu

March 8, 2013

Abstract

We examine the system given by

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u &= \lambda (v+1)^p & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &= \gamma (u+1)^\theta & \Omega, \\ u &= v = 0 & \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where λ, γ are positive parameters and where $1 < p \le \theta$ and where Ω is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$. We show the extremal solutions associated with the above system are bounded provided

$$\frac{N}{2} < 1 + \frac{2(\theta+1)}{p\theta - 1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} + \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1} - \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}}} \right).$$

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.

Key words: Extremal solution, Stable solution, Regularity of solutions.

1 Introduction

In this work we examine the following system:

$$(N)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta u &= \lambda (v+1)^p & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &= \gamma (u+1)^\theta & \Omega, \\ u &= v = 0 & \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $\lambda, \gamma > 0$ are positive parameters and where $p, \theta > 1$. Our interest is in the regularity of the extremal solutions associated with $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$. In particular we are interested when the extremal solutions of $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ are bounded, since one can then apply elliptic regularity theory to show the extremal solutions are classical solutions. The nonlinearities we examine naturally fit into the following class:

(R): f is smooth, increasing, convex on $\mathbb{R}$ with $f(0) = 1$ and f is superlinear at ∞ (i.e. $\lim_{u \to \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u} = \infty$).

1.1 Second order scalar case

For a nonlinearity f of type (R) consider the following second order scalar analog of the above system given by

$$(Q)_\lambda \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

This scalar equation is now quite well understood whenever Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$. See, for instance, [1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12]. We now list the properties one comes to expect when studying $(Q)_\lambda$.

- There exists a finite positive critical parameter λ^*, called the **extremal parameter**, such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ there exists a a smooth **minimal solution** u_λ of $(Q)_\lambda$. By minimal solution, we mean here that if v is another solution of $(Q)_\lambda$ then $v \geq u_\lambda$ a.e. in Ω.

- For each $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ the minimal solution u_λ is **semi-stable** in the sense that

  $$\int_\Omega \lambda f'(u_\lambda) \psi^2 dx \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla \psi|^2 dx, \qquad \forall \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

  and is unique among all the weak semi-stable solutions.

- The map $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda(x)$ is increasing on $(0, \lambda^*)$ for each $x \in \Omega$. This allows one to define $u^*(x) := \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \lambda^*} u_\lambda(x)$, the so-called **extremal solution**, which can be shown to be a weak solution of $(Q)_{\lambda^*}$. In addition one can show that u^* is the unique weak solution of $(Q)_{\lambda^*}$. See [9].

- There are no solutions of $(Q)_\lambda$ (even in a very weak sense) for $\lambda > \lambda^*$.

A question which has attracted a lot of attention is whether the extremal function u^* is a classical solution of $(Q)_{\lambda^*}$. This is of interest since one can then apply the results from [8] to start a second branch of solutions emanating from (λ^*, u^*). The answer typically depends on the nonlinearity f, the dimension N and the geometry of the domain Ω. We now list some known results.

- [8] Suppose $f(u) = e^u$. If $N < 10$ then u^* is bounded. For $N \geq 10$ and Ω the unit ball $u^*(x) = -2\log(|x|)$.
- [4] Suppose f satisfies (R) but without the convexity assumption and Ω is the unit ball. Then u^* is bounded for $N < 10$. In view of the above result this is optimal.
- On general domains, and if f satisfies (R), then u^* is bounded for $N \leq 3$ [12]. Recently this has been improved to $N \leq 4$ provided the domain is convex (again one can drop the convexity assumption on f), see [3].

We now examine the generalization of $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ given by

$$(P)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda f(v) & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &=& \gamma g(u) & \Omega, \\ u &=& v = 0 & \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

where f and g satisfy (R). Define $\mathcal{Q} = \{(\lambda, \gamma) : \lambda, \gamma > 0\}$,

$$\mathcal{U} := \{(\lambda,\gamma) \in \mathcal{Q} : \text{ there exists a smooth solution } (u,v) \text{ of } (P)_{\lambda,\gamma}\},$$

and set $\Upsilon := \partial\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Q}$. Note that Υ is the analog of λ^* for the above system. A generalization of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ was examined in [11] and many results were obtained, including

Theorem. *(Montenegro, [11]) Suppose f and g satisfy (R). Then*

1. *$\mathcal{U}$ is nonempty.*
2. *For all $(\lambda,\gamma) \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists a smooth, minimal solution of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$.*
3. *For each $0 < \sigma < \infty$ there is some $0 < \lambda_\sigma^* < \infty$ such that $\mathcal{U} \cap \{(\lambda, \sigma\lambda) : 0 < \lambda\}$ is given by $\{(\lambda,\sigma\lambda) : 0 < \lambda < \lambda_\sigma^*\} \cup \mathcal{H}$ where $\mathcal{H}$ is either the empty set or $\{(\lambda_\sigma^*, \sigma\lambda_\sigma^*)\}$. The map $\sigma \mapsto \lambda_\sigma^*$ is bounded on compact*

subsets of $(0,\infty)$*. Fix* $0<\sigma<\infty$ *and let* (u_λ, v_λ) *denote the smooth minimal solution of* $(P)_{\lambda,\sigma\lambda}$ *for* $0<\lambda<\lambda_\sigma^*$*. Then* $u_\lambda(x), v_\lambda(x)$ *are increasing in* λ *and hence*

$$u^*(x) := \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \lambda_\sigma^*} u_\lambda(x), \quad v^*(x) := \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \lambda_\sigma^*} u_\lambda(x),$$

are well defined and can be shown to be a weak solution of $(P)_{\lambda_\sigma^*, \sigma\lambda_\sigma^*}$*.*

Our notation will vary slightly from above. Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ and set $\sigma := \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$. Define $\Gamma_\sigma := \{(\lambda, \sigma\lambda) : \frac{\lambda^*}{2} < \lambda < \lambda^*\}$ and we let (u^*, v^*), called the **extremal solution** associated with $(P)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$, be the pointwise limit of the minimal solutions along the ray Γ_σ as $\lambda \nearrow \lambda^*$. As mentioned above (u^*, v^*) is a weak solution of $(N)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$ in a suitable sense.

The following result shows that the minimal solutions are stable in some suitable sense and this will be crucial in obtaining regularity of the extremal solutions associated with $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$.

Theorem. *(Montenegro [11]) Let* $(\lambda,\gamma) \in \mathcal{U}$ *and let* (u, v) *denote the minimal solution of* $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$*. Then* (u, v) *is semi-stable in the sense that there is some smooth* $0 < \zeta, \chi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ *and* $0 \le \eta$ *such that*

$$-\Delta\zeta = \lambda f'(v)\chi + \eta\zeta, \qquad -\Delta\chi = \gamma g'(u)\zeta + \eta\chi, \qquad in\ \Omega. \tag{1}$$

We give an alternate proof of a result which is slightly different than the above one, but which is sufficient for our purposes. Fix $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$, $\sigma := \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$ and let (u_λ, v_λ) denote minimal solution of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ on the ray Γ_σ. Taking a derivative in λ of $(P)_{\lambda,\sigma\lambda}$ shows that

$$-\Delta\tilde{\zeta} = \lambda f'(v_\lambda)\tilde{\chi} + f(v_\lambda), \quad -\Delta\tilde{\chi} = \lambda\sigma g'(u_\lambda)\tilde{\zeta} + \sigma g(u_\lambda) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $\tilde{\zeta} := \partial_\lambda u_\lambda$ and $\tilde{\chi} := \partial_\lambda v_\lambda$. Using the monotonicity of u_λ, v_λ and the maximum principle shows that $\tilde{\zeta}, \tilde{\chi} > 0$.

We now recall some known results regarding the regularity of the extremal solutions associated with various systems. In what follows Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

- In [5] the following system

$$(E)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda e^v & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &=& \gamma e^u & \Omega, \\ u &=& v = 0 & \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

was examined. It was shown that if $3 \leq N \leq 9$ and

$$\frac{N-2}{8} < \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*} < \frac{8}{N-2},$$

then the extremal solution (u^*, v^*) is bounded. Note that not only does the dimension N play a role but how close (λ^*, γ^*) are to the diagonal $\gamma = \lambda$ plays a role. When $\gamma = \lambda$ one can show that the above system reduces to the scalar equation $-\Delta u = \lambda e^u$. We remark that we were unable to extend the methods used in [5] to handle $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ except in the case where $p = \theta$.

- In [7] the system

$$(P')_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad -\Delta u = \lambda F(u,v), \qquad -\Delta v = \gamma G(u,v) \qquad \text{in } \Omega,$$

with $u = v = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ was examined examined in the cases where $F(u,v) = f'(u)g(v)$, $G(u,v) = f(u)g'(v)$ (resp. $F(u,v) = f(u)g'(v)$, $G(u,v) = f'(u)g(v)$) and were denoted by $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ (resp. $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$). It was shown that the extremal solutions associated with $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ were bounded provided Ω was a convex domain in R^N where $N \leq 3$ and f and g satisfied conditions similar to (R). Regularity results regarding $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ we also obtained in the case where at least one of of f and g were explicit nonlinearities given by $(u+1)^p$ or e^u.

2 Main Results

We now state our main results.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that* $1 < p \leq \theta$, $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ *and let* (u^*, v^*) *denote the extremal solution associated with* $(N)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$. *Suppose that*

$$\frac{N}{2} < 1 + \frac{2(\theta+1)}{p\theta - 1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} + \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1} - \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}}}\right).$$

Then u^*, v^* *are bounded.*

There are two main steps in proving the above theorems. We first show that minimal solutions of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$, which are semi-stable in the sense of (1), satisfy a stability inequality which is reminiscent of semi-stability in the sense of the second order scalar equations. This is given by Lemma 1.

The second ingredient will be a pointwise comparison result between u and v, given in Lemma 2. We remark that this was motivated by [13] and a similar result was used in [6].

Lemma 1. *Let (u,v) denote a semi-stable solution of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ in the sense of (1). Then*

$$2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma}\int\sqrt{f'(v)g'(u)}\phi\psi\leq\int|\nabla\phi|^2+|\nabla\psi|^2, \qquad (2)$$

for all $\phi,\psi\in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Taking $\phi=\psi$ gives

$$\sqrt{\lambda\gamma}\int\sqrt{f'(v)g'(u)}\phi^2\leq\int|\nabla\phi|^2 \qquad (3)$$

for all $\phi\in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. Since (u,v) is a semi-stable solution of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ there is some $0<\zeta,\chi\in H_0^1(\Omega)$ smooth such that

$$\frac{-\Delta\zeta}{\zeta}\geq\lambda f'(v)\frac{\chi}{\zeta},\qquad\frac{-\Delta\chi}{\chi}\geq\gamma g'(u)\frac{\zeta}{\chi},\qquad\text{in }\Omega.$$

Let $\phi,\psi\in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and multiply the first equation by ϕ^2 and the second by ψ^2 and integrate over Ω to arrive at

$$\int\lambda f'(v)\frac{\chi}{\zeta}\phi^2\leq\int|\nabla\phi|^2,\qquad\int\gamma g'(u)\frac{\zeta}{\chi}\psi^2\leq\int|\nabla\psi|^2,$$

where we have utilized the result that for any sufficiently smooth $E>0$ we have

$$\int\frac{-\Delta E}{E}\phi^2\leq\int|\nabla\phi|^2,$$

for all $\phi\in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$. We now add the inequalities to obtain

$$\int(\lambda f'(v)\phi^2)\frac{\chi}{\zeta}+(\gamma g'(u)\psi^2)\frac{\zeta}{\chi}\leq\int|\nabla\phi|^2+|\nabla\psi|^2. \qquad (4)$$

Now note that

$$2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma f'(v)g'(u)}\phi\psi\leq 2t\lambda f'(v)\phi^2+\frac{1}{2t}\gamma g'(u)\psi^2,$$

for any $t>0$. Taking $2t=\frac{\chi(x)}{\zeta(x)}$ gives

$$2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma f'(v)g(u)}\phi\psi\leq(\lambda f'(v)\phi^2)\frac{\chi}{\zeta}+(\gamma g'(u)\psi^2)\frac{\zeta}{\chi},$$

and putting this back into (4) gives the desired result.

$\square$

Lemma 2. *Let* (u,v) *denote a smooth solution of* $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ *and suppose that* $\theta \geq p > 1$*. Define*

$$\alpha := \max\left\{0, \left(\frac{\gamma(p+1)}{\lambda(\theta+1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}} - 1\right\}.$$

Then

$$\lambda(\theta+1)(v+1+\alpha)^{p+1} \geq \gamma(p+1)(u+1)^{\theta+1} \qquad \textit{in } \Omega. \tag{5}$$

Proof. Let (u,v) denote a smooth solution of $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ and define $w := v + 1 + \alpha - C(u+1)^t$ where

$$C := \left(\frac{\gamma(p+1)}{\lambda(\theta+1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad t := \frac{\theta+1}{p+1} \geq 1.$$

Note that $w \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and define $\Omega_0 := \{x \in \Omega : w(x) < 0\}$. If Ω_0 is empty then we are done so we suppose that Ω_0 is nonempty. Note that since $w \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ we have $w = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_0$. A computation shows that

$$-\Delta w = \gamma(u+1)^\theta - Ct(u+1)^{t-1}\lambda(v+1)^p + Ct(t-1)(u+1)^{t-2}|\nabla u|^2, \qquad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and since $t \geq 1$ we have

$$-\Delta w \geq \gamma(u+1)^\theta - Ct(u+1)^{t-1}\lambda(v+1)^p \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Note that we have, by definition,

$$v+1 \leq v+1+\alpha < C(u+1)^t \qquad \text{in } \Omega_0,$$

and so we have

$$-\Delta w \geq \gamma(u+1)^\theta - C^{p+1}t\lambda(u+1)^{tp+t-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_0,$$

but the right hand side of this is zero and hence we have $-\Delta w \geq 0$ in Ω_0 with $w = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_0$ and hence $w \geq 0$ in Ω_0, which is a contradiction. So Ω_0 is empty.

$\square$

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ and let $\sigma := \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$ and suppose that (u,v) denotes a minimal solution of $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ on the ray Γ_σ. Put $\phi := (v+1)^t - 1$, where $\frac{1}{2} < t$, into (3) to obtain

$$\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\int (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}(u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}((v+1)^t - 1)^2 \leq t^2 \int (v+1)^{2t-2}|\nabla v|^2,$$

and multiply $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ by $(v+1)^{2t-1}-1$ and integrate by parts to obtain

$$t^2 \int (v+1)^{2t-2}|\nabla v|^2 = \frac{t^2\gamma}{2t-1}\int (u+1)^\theta((v+1)^{2t-1}-1).$$

Equating these and expanding the squares and dropping some positive terms gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\int (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}(u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{2t} \\ \leq \frac{t^2\gamma}{2t-1}\int (u+1)^\theta (v+1)^{2t-1} \\ +2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\int (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}(u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^t. \qquad (6)\end{aligned}$$

We now use Lemma 2 to get a lower bound for

$$I := \int (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}(u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{2t},$$

but we need to rework the pointwise estimate (5) first. From (5) we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{\gamma(p+1)}{\lambda(\theta+1)}}(u+1)^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}} \leq (v+1+\alpha)^{\frac{p+1}{2}},$$

and for all $\delta > 0$ there is some $C(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$(v+1+\alpha)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \leq (1+\delta)(v+1)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} + C(\delta)\alpha^{\frac{p+1}{2}}.$$

From this we see that there is some $C_1 = C_1(\delta, p, \alpha)$ such that

$$(v+1)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma(p+1)}{\lambda(\theta+1)}}\frac{(u+1)^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}}}{1+\delta} - C_1.$$

We now rewrite I as

$$I = \int (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{2t-1}(v+1)^{\frac{p+1}{2}},$$

and use the above estimate to show that

$$I \geq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma(p+1)}{\lambda(\theta+1)}}\frac{1}{\delta+1}\int (u+1)^\theta (v+1)^{2t-1} - C_1\int (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{2t-1}. \quad (7)$$

We now return to (6) and write the left hand side, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is small, as

$$\varepsilon\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}I + (1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}I,$$

and we leave the first term alone and we use the above lower estimate for I on the second term. Putting this back into (6) and after some rearranging one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}I \quad &+ \quad \gamma K\int (u+1)^{\theta}(v+1)^{2t-1} \\ &\leq \quad 2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\; I_1 + (1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}C_1\; I_2 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where

$$K := \frac{(1-\varepsilon)}{1+\delta}\sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} - \frac{t^2}{2t-1},$$

$$I_1 := \int (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}(u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{t}, \qquad \text{and}$$

$$I_2 := \int (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{2t-1}.$$

For the moment we assume the following **claims:** for all $T > 1$ and $k > 1$

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{T^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}}}\int (u+1)^{\theta}(v+1)^{2t-1} + |\Omega| T^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} k^{2t-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{k^{\frac{p+1}{2}}}\int (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}+2t}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{T^t}\int (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}(v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}+2t} + |\Omega| T^{\frac{p-1}{2}+t} k^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{T^{|\frac{p+1}{2}-t|}}{k^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}}}\int (u+1)^{\theta}(v+1)^{2t-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Putting (9) and (10) back into (8) one arrives at an estimate of the form

$$K_1 I + K_2 \int (u+1)^{\theta}(v+1)^{2t-1} \leq C(\varepsilon, p, \theta, T, k, \delta) \tag{11}$$

where

$$K_1 := \varepsilon\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta} - \frac{2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}}{T^t} - \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\; C_1}{k^{\frac{p+1}{2}}}, \qquad \text{and}$$

$$K_2 := \gamma K - \frac{2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\, T^{|\frac{p+1}{2}-t|}}{k^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}}} - \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\, C_1}{T^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}}},$$

and where $C(\varepsilon, p, \theta, T, k, \delta)$ is a positive finite constant which is uniform on the ray Γ_σ. Define

$$t_0 := \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} + \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1} - \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}}}$$

and note that $t_0 > 1$ for all $p, \theta > 1$. Fix $1 < t < t_0$ and hence

$$\sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} - \frac{t^2}{2t-1} > 0.$$

We now fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small such that $K > 0$. We now fix $T > 1$ sufficiently large such that

$$\varepsilon\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta} - \frac{2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}}{T^t}$$

(this is the first two terms from K_1) and

$$\gamma K - \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{\lambda\gamma p\theta}\, C_1}{T^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}}}$$

(the first and third terms from K_2) are positive and bounded away from zero on the the ray Γ_σ. We now take $k > 1$ sufficiently big such that K_1, K_2 are positive and bounded away from zero on the ray Γ_σ and hence we have estimates of the form: for all $1 < t < t_0$ there is some $C_t > 0$ such that

$$\int (u+1)^\theta (v+1)^{2t-1} \le C_t, \tag{12}$$

where C_t is some finite uniform constant on the ray Γ_σ. Using the pointwise lower estimate (5) for $v+1$ gives: for all $1 < t < t_0$ there is some $\tilde{C}_t < \infty$, uniform along the ray Γ_σ, such that

$$\int (u+1)^{\theta + (\frac{(\theta+1)(2t-1)}{p+1}} \le \tilde{C}_t, \tag{13}$$

and hence this estimate also holds if one replaces u with u^*. We now let $1 < t < t_0$ and note that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma}\int |\nabla v|^2 = \int (u+1)^\theta v \le \int (u+1)^\theta (v+1) \le \int (u+1)^\theta (v+1)^{2t-1} \le C_t,$$

by (12) and hence we can pass to the limit and see that $v^* \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. We now proceed to show that v^* is bounded in low dimensions. First note that

$$\frac{-\Delta v^*}{\gamma^*} = (u^*+1)^\theta = \frac{(u^*+1)^\theta}{v^*+1} v^* + \frac{(u^*+1)^\theta}{v^*+1} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

To show that v^* is bounded it is sufficient, since $v^* \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, to show that $\frac{(u^*+1)^\theta}{v^*+1} \in L^T(\Omega)$ for some $T > \frac{N}{2}$. Using (5) and passing to the limit one sees there is some $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{(u^*+1)^\theta}{v^*+1} \le C(u^*+1)^{\frac{p\theta-1}{p+1}} + C \qquad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and so $\frac{(u^*+1)^\theta}{v^*+1} \in L^T(\Omega)$ for some $T > \frac{N}{2}$ provided

$$\frac{(p\theta-1)}{p+1}\frac{N}{2} < \theta + \frac{(\theta+1)(2t_0-1)}{p+1},$$

after considering (13). This rearranges into

$$\frac{N}{2} < 1 + 2\frac{(\theta+1)}{p+1} t_0,$$

which is the desired result. We now use $(N)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ and elliptic regularity to see that u^* is also bounded.

$\square$

Proof of Claims (9) and (10). We first prove (9). We write I_2 as

$$I_2 = \int_{u+1 \ge T} + \int_{u+1<T, v+1 \le k} + \int_{u+1<T, v+1>k},$$

where the integrands are the same as in I_2. Note that the first integral is less than or equal

$$\int_{u+1>T} (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} \left(\frac{u+1}{T} \right)^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}} (v+1)^{2t-1} \le \frac{1}{T^{\frac{\theta+1}{2}}} \int (u+1)^\theta (v+1)^{2t-1}.$$

The second integral is trivial to get upper estimate on. One estimates the third integral in the same way as the first to see that

$$\int_{u+1<T, v+1>k} \le \frac{1}{k^{\frac{p+1}{2}}} \int (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}+2t}.$$

Combining these estimates gives (9). We now prove (10). We write

$$I_1 = \int_{v+1 \geq T} + \int_{v+1<T, u+1<k} + \int_{v+1<T, u+1 \geq k},$$

where the integrands are the same as I_1. Note that the first integral is less than or equal

$$\int_{v+1>T} (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}+t} \left(\frac{v+1}{T} \right)^t (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}},$$

and this is less than or equal

$$\frac{1}{T^t} \int (v+1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}+2t} (u+1)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}.$$

The second integral is easily estimated. We rewrite the third integral as

$$\int_{v+1<T, u+1 \geq k} (v+1)^{2t-1} (u+1)^{\theta} \left((v+1)^{\frac{p+1}{2}-t} (u+1)^{\frac{-\theta-1}{2}} \right),$$

and we now estimate the terms inside the bracket in the obvious manner. Combining these gives (10).

□

References

[1] H. Brezis, T. Cazenave, Y. Martel, A. Ramiandrisoa; *Blow up for* $u_t - \Delta u = g(u)$ *revisited*, Adv. Diff. Eq., 1 (1996) 73-90.

[2] H. Brezis and L. Vazquez, *Blow-up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid 10 (1997), no. 2, 443–469.

[3] X. Cabré, *Regularity of minimizers of semilinear elliptic problems up to dimension four*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 63 (2010), no. 10, 1362-1380.

[4] X. Cabré and A. Capella, *Regularity of radial minimizers and extremal solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Funct. Anal. 238 (2006), no. 2, 709–733.

[5] C. Cowan, *Regularity of the extremal solutions in a Gelfand system problem*, Advanced Nonlinear Studies, Vol. 11, No. 3 , p. 695 Aug., 2011.

[6] C. Cowan, P. Esposito and N. Ghoussoub, *Regularity of extremal solutions in fourth order nonlinear eigenvalue problems on general domains.* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 28 (2010), no. 3, 10331050.

[7] C. Cowan and M. Fazly, *Regularity of the extremal solutions associated to some elliptic systems*, preprint, 2012.

[8] M.G. Crandall and P.H. Rabinowitz, *Some continuation and variation methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 58 (1975), pp.207-218.

[9] Y. Martel, *Uniqueness of weak extremal solutions of nonlinear elliptic problems*, Houston J. Math. 23 (1997), 161-168.

[10] F. Mignot, J-P. Puel; *Sur une classe de problemes non lineaires avec non linearite positive, croissante, convexe*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 5 (1980) 791-836.

[11] M. Montenegro, *Minimal solutions for a class of elliptic systems*, Bull. London Math. Soc.**37** (2005) 405-416.

[12] G. Nedev, *Regularity of the extremal solution of semilinear elliptic equations,* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math. 330 (2000), no. 11, 997–1002.

[13] P. Souplet, *The proof of the Lane-Emden conjecture in four space dimensions.* Adv. Math. 221 (2009), no. 5, 14091427.